



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

09/725453

EXAMINER

Aftergut

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1733

01252006

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Jeff Aftergut (PTO) (3) Chuck Ego (appl. rep.)
(2) Ira Schultz (appl. rep.) (4) Thorsten Scheibel (appl.)

Date of Interview 1-25-06

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Televideo Conference ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, brief description: samples of preform and finished grid assemblies; drawing describing fiber placement pattern

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed: Matheij et al, Koury

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed in detail the 112 issues as they relate to description and enablement. Discussed the filing of claims related to an article rather than a process. Proposed for the process to take out the requirements regarding constant fiber volume and thickness in the grid arrangement. Noted that the question then would be if one would use TFP of Matheij with grid forming via laying or winding. Questioned whether exclusion of volume and thickness would create best made problem. Noted exclusion would resolve most of the 112 issues as they related to how the pattern was applied to achieve constant volume and thickness
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary. A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

Jeff Aftergut